







LUNCHEON

The Turkish Minister to Israel, Mr. Seyidhan, and Mrs. Zaid left Israel on vacation yesterday.

Social & Personal

Mr. Yosef Laron has been appointed as the new director of the Israel National Fund.

Mr. A. Tscheltz, Chairman of the Institute of Electrical Engineers in Israel, has left for Stockholm to participate in the meetings of the International Commission on Illumination.

Dr. H.E. Hirschberg will lecture on the "Problems of the Modern Community in Israel" under the auspices of the Israel Oriental Society.

PASS - To finish, wife of Mr. Leo Pass, on Saturday, June 23, 1961 at the Asanah Hospital, Tel Aviv - a daughter.

OBITUARY

Mr. Isadore Levin The death took place on Friday, June 23, 1961, at the Asanah Hospital, Tel Aviv, of Mr. Isadore Levin, at the age of 61.

Israel Pianist Returns From Concert Tour

TEL AVIV, Sunday - The Israeli pianist, Peter Wolfish, was the soloist at the opening of the ninth subscription concert of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra here tonight.

Mr. Wolfish returned to this country last Thursday following a world tour which lasted three years. In 1958 he won First Prize at the Bartok International Competition.

U.S. STUDY GROUP TO VISIT JERUSALEM

A study group of the American Chaldean Palestine Committee, which will cross into Israel from the Old City in Mandelbaum Gate this morning, is to be received by the Jerusalem Municipality at the City Hall at 4:30 this afternoon.

Old City Monks At Ein Karem Mass

Twenty-five Franciscan monks who had crossed from the Old City on Friday afternoon celebrated a pontifical High Mass yesterday morning at the Church of St. John the Baptist at Ein Karem, the traditional birthplace of St. John, on the occasion of the saint's day.

Gov't Export Agencies Move From Jerusalem

A number of Government Agencies dealing with exports are being transferred from Jerusalem to Haifa, where an export center, similar to the Investment Centre, is being set up.

The Hebrew National OPERA

TEL AVIV: Sabbath Performance at 8.30 p.m. JERUSALEM: Sabbath Performance at 8.30 p.m. Samson & Delilah Opera in 3 acts (4 scenes) by Saint-Saens, with EDIS DE PHILIPPE

Anglo-Saxon Settlers At Mapai Rally

KPAR SABA, Sunday. - Settlers who had come from Anglo-Saxon countries to take part in the public life of the Jewish State, were active in the Jewish National Fund. The settlers were active in the Jewish National Fund during World War II, in the subsequent immigration period after the war, and have since been active in the cultural and public life of the Jewish State.

Speaking on "Public Opinion in Israel," Mr. Gershon Agon, editor of the Jerusalem Post, declared that there was no Government or commercial control of the press in this country, nor any dictatorial proprietorship or trustification of the press such as had led to the alarming shrinkage in the number of newspapers in so many countries of the world.

Many of the papers in this country were Party organs, and in the main, journalists close to work on the papers whose views corresponded to theirs. In any case, no one on any paper was obliged to write what he did not believe. Mr. Agon stated, as between trustification and the killing of newspapers because they did not earn huge profits, which was the trend in the world today, and the proliferation of papers because their publishers were Partisan with a message to convey, and were free of the profit motive, he preferred Israel's way.

Opposition Myths

He blamed part of the Opposition press for spreading myths, including the legend that prospective investors were obliged to turn over control of their enterprises to the Histadrut. Editors and sub-editors often wielded a lethal power by emphasizing, suppressing or distorting news items. It was the duty of all newspapers, including Party organs, to present a full and fair picture that the reader need not resort to other papers, Mr. Agon declared.

Nevertheless, the Hebrew Press compared very favorably with that in any other country, and their weekly supplements had few parallels anywhere in the world. He stated, Israel owed it to Jews abroad to dispel some of the myths and to publish them in an overseas weekly in English, and perhaps also in French and Spanish, Mr. Agon said. A quarterly on the same lines might also follow later, he added.

Mr. Baruch Rosenthal, speaking on "Defence and the Gathering of the Exiles," emphasized the importance to Israel's defence of highly skilled personnel, and appealed to Jewish youth in Anglo-



At the Cinema

"OUT of Evil" the full-length feature produced by the Keren Hayessod, is now being shown in a somewhat improved version at the Tamar Cinema in Tel Aviv. As performed at the film festival in Venice last year, the film was unduly complex, both in its depiction of present-day life in Israel, and in its artificially superimposed Biblical marionette sequences. At the Venice showing both dialogue and narration were confusing.

The present version achieves greater lucidity, but the handling of the marionette sequences is still unsatisfactory. The figures, although finely conceived by Dr. Paul Lewy, are not suitable for cinematic presentation, since the primitive staging failed to harmonize with the technical aspects of the rest of the film.

The film's producers were apparently thwarted by the need to blend the elements of personal tragedy and kibbutz life in the middle thirties, life in contemporary Israel beginning with the outbreak of the War of Independence, and a symbolic paper play - into an appealing and convincing story.

Both the documentary open-air sequences, directed by Joseph Krumpholtz, and the photographs of the kibbutz life, however, lack atmosphere. Carol Rabin's music is effective, the central march-theme giving emotional stress of aerial views of Israel today. Of the actors, Esther Marath, Itzhak Shilo, Nahum Buchman, Zuzka Repaport and Eliezer Wharman are most effective.

War and Prejudice

"HOME of the Brave" (Eli-son, Jerusalem), like "The Naked and the Dead," is a war story set in the South Pacific. The novel is one of the central figures in a Jew who must face anti-Semitism, as well as the jungle and the Japs; here the hero is a Negro beset by race prejudice. He is shown suffering from the after-effects of a battle in which his "white" Protestant friend is killed. He is cured through a frankly kaleidoscoped psychological process, in the course of which the Negro problem is shown in broadly human dimensions. The problem does not disappear with the hero's cure. He comes through with no more than a better understanding of, and therefore a more rational approach to, his problem. It is an excellent film, marred mainly by a frustrating sound-track.

Son of Robin Hood

"ROGUES of Sherwood Forest" (Orion) stars John Derek and Diana Lynn (the Queen) in a colorful and action-packed melodrama about the son of Robin Hood. Teenagers seem to be mad about it.

Summer Recreation and Convalescence

ORANIM PENSION AND REST HOUSE Tel. 3337, Jerusalem Reserve now for July. Guests are requested to bring their egg and meat coupons with them. Kasher, Rabbinical supervision.

Where to Go

JERUSALEM 8.0: Jerusalem Biblical Zoo; 8.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 8.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 8.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 8.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 8.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 8.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 8.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 8.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 8.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 9.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 10.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 11.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 12.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 13.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 14.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 15.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 16.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 17.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 18.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 19.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 20.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 21.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 22.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 23.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 24.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 25.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 26.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 27.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 28.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 29.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 30.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 31.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 32.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 33.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 34.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 35.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 36.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 37.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 38.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 39.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 40.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 41.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 42.9: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.0: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.1: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.2: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.3: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.4: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.5: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.6: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.7: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, engravings, ceramics); 43.8: 8.0: Chagall Exhibition (old, drawings, en











**YOUR TIME IS PRECIOUS—BE PUNCTUAL**



## ECONOMIC NOTES: HOME AND ABROAD

## More Progress in Agriculture No Veto Possible on Red China

Impressive figures are shown in the progress record of Jewish agriculture in 1950 (1949/50). The area under cultivation has increased from 750,000 dunam in 1948 to 2.8 m. dunam, including 80,000 dunam of vegetables, against 30,000 three years ago. The number of laying hens has risen from one to over three million, and fish ponds, mostly in the Haifa area, cover today an area of 20,000 dunam, more than twice that in 1948.

The value of last year's total agricultural production, excluding citrus, reached IL 48.5m., an increase of 36 per cent over 1948/49, with Jewish farming accounting for IL 43.7m. The value of the principal branches was (in IL million): Grains, 8; milk, 8.2; eggs, 7.9; vegetables and potatoes, 7; meat, 4.7; fish, 2.3; and manure, 2.2.

**Diamonds Recover**  
Slow recovery of the diamond industry is reflected in figures published in "The Israel Diamond," the new Hebrew-English organ of the Israel Diamond Club. In the peak year of 1948 the industry employed some 4,000 persons against some 2,000 today, and the value of exported polished diamonds exceeded LP.5m. In 1950, imports of rough diamonds amounted to 460,043 carats valued \$3,354,161 whereas exports of polished diamonds accounted for 103,467 carats, valued IL 3,532,834. This latter amount includes U.S. \$9.1 m., Canadian \$262,821, Swiss Francs 40,464, Belgian Francs 7.1m., and \$126,532.

**Immigrants and Industry**  
In a special supplement of "Economic News," vol. 3, No. 7-8, published on behalf of the Committee for Industrial Credits and edited by H. Margulies, Dr. J. A. Colton gives a detailed summary of an inquiry into small and medium-sized industrial establishments of new immigrants. The investigation deals with 107 undertakings engaged in 11 different trades. The 465 owners are organized in 29 one-man firms, 44 partnerships and 34 cooperatives. The report notes lack of coordination in Government offices dealing with the affairs of these newcomers and suggests the establishment of an Industrial Immigrants' Department in the camps.

**Increased Output of "Mekorot"**  
The "Mekorot" water company has increased its output in 1950 from 31m. to 82 m. cubic metres, of which 15 m. went to the Negev, according to "Israel Economic Bulletin." It is planned to

increase the output in the current year by 100m. cubic metres, involving a new investment of IL 8m.

**Radio Sets to Turkey**  
The first shipment of radio sets was received favourably on the Turkish market, and additional orders amounting to \$200,000 could be placed.

Turkey's new electric light bulb factory began production at Istanbul this month. It is reported from Ankara that the General Electric Co., the Turkish Ish Bank and a Turkish firm have jointly subscribed the capital for the new plant which has a capacity of six million bulbs yearly, sufficient for the present needs of the country. The factory can be enlarged to include the manufacture of radio receivers and electrical household appliances. Women comprise 98 per cent of the personnel employed.

**American Union's Donations**  
Since 1935 the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union (ILGWU) has given more than \$20m. to charitable and Labour causes in the United States and abroad. Each of its 431,000 members contributes \$1 a year to be donated by the union. The largest donation in 1951, \$150,000, will be used to buy

land holdings in Egypt. The total area of private land holdings in Egypt is estimated to have been six million feddans and that of state and public utility holdings 2.5m. (1 feddan=1,038 acres) in 1949. About one third of the private holdings were held by 2.5m. owners (an average of 0.83 acres per owner); another third by 188,000 owners (average per owner, 10.7 acres); and the balance by 12,000 owners (average per owner, 196.6 acres). Among those 12,000 owners, about 2,000 owned one million feddans (500 acres per person) or one sixth of Egypt's private lands.

**South African Trade**  
A preliminary statement shows that South Africa's foreign trade position improved considerably during 1950, the adverse balance falling to \$59.2m., from \$158.4m. in 1949. Import restrictions continued to be applied, and imports fell from \$315.3m. to

\$307.5m. The increase in exports, which rose from \$156.9m. to \$248.5m., stemmed from sales of gold which rose from \$10.5m. to \$37.7m. and from the higher price of wool, exports of which were valued at \$62.2m. in 1950; diamond exports, at \$20.1m., were almost double the 1949 value.

**Ministry of Materials For Britain**  
A bill will shortly be introduced in the House of Commons establishing a new government department which is to be styled the Ministry of Materials. The department which will be headed by Mr. Richard Stokes, Lord Privy Seal, will deal with supplies of raw materials for industry, which were until now a function of the Board of Trade and the Ministry of Supply.

**Poland's Public Finance**  
Poland's budget for 1951 estimates revenue at about \$4 billion and expenditure at \$2 billion, equal to \$2 billion, equal to \$2 billion respectively, on the basis of a purchasing power of 12 zlotys per dollar. About 80 per cent of the revenue is to come from the socialized sector of the economy. Almost the entire wholesale trade, 96 per cent of industry, 83 per cent of retail trade, all transportation and about 13 per cent of agricultural production

are nationalized or organized in co-operatives. Socialized economy requires about 41 per cent of expenditure, social and cultural purposes 31.6 per cent, administration and justice, 11.6 per cent, and national defence, 7.2 per cent.

**Distribution of Property in Egypt**  
The total area of private land holdings in Egypt is estimated to have been six million feddans and that of state and public utility holdings 2.5m. (1 feddan=1,038 acres) in 1949. About one third of the private holdings were held by 2.5m. owners (an average of 0.83 acres per owner); another third by 188,000 owners (average per owner, 10.7 acres); and the balance by 12,000 owners (average per owner, 196.6 acres). Among those 12,000 owners, about 2,000 owned one million feddans (500 acres per person) or one sixth of Egypt's private lands.

**China is Charter Member**  
But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

That situation would arise, even if the veto operated, because accepting Peking is an entirely different issue than voting in a new U.N. member. New applicants for U.N. membership, under express provision of the U.N. Charter, may be blackballed in the Security Council because the Council must recommend their applications to the General Assembly before the latter can vote on them.

China is Charter Member

But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

That situation would arise, even if the veto operated, because accepting Peking is an entirely different issue than voting in a new U.N. member. New applicants for U.N. membership, under express provision of the U.N. Charter, may be blackballed in the Security Council because the Council must recommend their applications to the General Assembly before the latter can vote on them.

China is Charter Member

But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

That situation would arise, even if the veto operated, because accepting Peking is an entirely different issue than voting in a new U.N. member. New applicants for U.N. membership, under express provision of the U.N. Charter, may be blackballed in the Security Council because the Council must recommend their applications to the General Assembly before the latter can vote on them.

China is Charter Member

But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

That situation would arise, even if the veto operated, because accepting Peking is an entirely different issue than voting in a new U.N. member. New applicants for U.N. membership, under express provision of the U.N. Charter, may be blackballed in the Security Council because the Council must recommend their applications to the General Assembly before the latter can vote on them.

China is Charter Member

But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

## PROBLEM OF DELEGATIONS' CREDENTIALS

By David Wesley

NOTHING has caused more raised eyebrows at the United Nations recently than the campaign in the United States Congress to veto to it that America will veto any attempt to seat Communist China in the world organization. The simple fact, apparently not understood in Congress, is that when a majority of U.N. members want New China in the organization, she will come in.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

That situation would arise, even if the veto operated, because accepting Peking is an entirely different issue than voting in a new U.N. member. New applicants for U.N. membership, under express provision of the U.N. Charter, may be blackballed in the Security Council because the Council must recommend their applications to the General Assembly before the latter can vote on them.

China is Charter Member

But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

That situation would arise, even if the veto operated, because accepting Peking is an entirely different issue than voting in a new U.N. member. New applicants for U.N. membership, under express provision of the U.N. Charter, may be blackballed in the Security Council because the Council must recommend their applications to the General Assembly before the latter can vote on them.

China is Charter Member

But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

That situation would arise, even if the veto operated, because accepting Peking is an entirely different issue than voting in a new U.N. member. New applicants for U.N. membership, under express provision of the U.N. Charter, may be blackballed in the Security Council because the Council must recommend their applications to the General Assembly before the latter can vote on them.

China is Charter Member

But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

That situation would arise, even if the veto operated, because accepting Peking is an entirely different issue than voting in a new U.N. member. New applicants for U.N. membership, under express provision of the U.N. Charter, may be blackballed in the Security Council because the Council must recommend their applications to the General Assembly before the latter can vote on them.

China is Charter Member

But China, of course, is not an applicant for membership but a Charter member of the organization. The seating problem here is only a question of credentials — which Chinese credentials, that is, are to be accepted. On this question, every U.N. body is its own master.

Also, because only a problem of credentials is involved, there can be no question of a veto in the Security Council. For more than a year the State Department, in recognition of the logical impossibility of vetoing a credentials issue, has publicized the fact that no veto on seating Peking could be valid. Recently, though, a harassed Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, pressed by the pro-Nationalist bloc in the Senate, announced that an American policy — that the United States would take the question of whether the Chinese Communists' bid could be vetoed to the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

There are, at least, three reasons, however, why the Court could scarcely be expected to take such an appeal very seriously.

One is the contradictory situation already described that could take place, where in two regimes of a single

member-country might be simultaneously represented in the organization.

Logically, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Secondly, the General Assembly has already spoken clearly on the subject. It adopted some time ago a United States-sponsored resolution specifying a series of questions that were to be considered procedural, rather than substantive, by the Security Council and therefore not vetoable. One was the

question of credentials of a member nation.

Thirdly, a logical absurdity is involved. As some one has pointed out, the Chiang Kai-shek regime could leave or be forced out of Formosa. Then, again, in Rockefeller Centre and set up shop there as the government of China indefinitely. If it could veto the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

If a veto were possible, it would accomplish one thing only — exclusion of Peking from the Security Council. It would not keep the General Assembly or any other U.N. organ — Communist China, in fact, is already a member of a U.N. specialized agency, the International Postal Union.

If a majority of the Assembly wanted to seat Peking, the new regime would be voted in there and then undoubtedly seated in rapid succession in all U.N. organs, except the Security Council — a clearly impossible situation.

## Rooms Wanted

FOR OVERSEAS VISITORS  
to ZIONIST CONGRESS IN J